

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed May 2, 2007 has been carefully considered. Within the Office Action Claims 1-55 have been rejected. The Applicants have amended Claims 1, 10, 11, 16, 23, 24, 29, 36, 37, 41, 50, and 51. The Applicants have cancelled Claim 54 without prejudice.

Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Rejection under U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-3, 10-14, 16, 23-27, 41-43 and 50-54 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,130,669 (hereinafter "Moon"). The Applicants respectfully traverse.

According to the M.P.E.P., a claim is anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a), (b) and (e) only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.

Moon describes a portable information terminal having an expandable data input unit. Figure 4 of Moon shows the device having two keypad sections 24A, 26A coupled to the housing about two hinges 21 on opposite sides of the housing. Both keypad sections portions of the device flip open away from one another about their respective hinges to expose the keypad underneath. However, Moon does not disclose a keyboard underneath the number pad such that said number pad folds out sideways with respect to the housing about one hinge axis to reveal the entire keyboard, as in Claim 1. Instead, Moon discloses two portions which each fold out about two separate hinge axes to reveal the entire keyboard. With regards to Claim 16, Moon does not disclose that the number dial pad has a substantially similar width dimension as the housing upon which it is hingedly coupled nor that the second portion folds out sideways with respect to the

housing about one hinge axis to reveal the keyboard underneath. Instead, Moon discloses that each number pad section covers only a portion of the housing upon which it sits. With regards to Claim 41, Moon does not disclose a second portion of the housing having an input member thereon, the second portion coupled to said first portion and having a width dimension substantially the same as a corresponding width dimension of the second portion, the first portion rotates about a first hinge axis to reveal the input member beneath the display screen. Again, Moon discloses two number pad sections which each covers only a portion of the housing upon which they sit, whereby each portion folds on its own hinge to expose the keypad underneath. Since Moon does not disclose each and every element/limitation of the claimed subject matter, the claimed subject matter is distinguishable over Moon. For at least these reasons, Claims 1, 16 and 41 are allowable over Moon.

Claims 2,3, 10-14, 23-27, 42, 43 and 50-54 are dependent on Independent Claims 1, 16 and 41. As stated above, Claims 1, 16 and 41 are allowable over Moon. Accordingly, Claims 2,3, 10-14, 23-27, 42, 43 and 50-54 are allowable for being dependent on allowable base claims.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 29-31 and 36-39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Moon in view of U.S. Publication No. 2003/0,073,462 (hereinafter “Zatloukal”). This rejection is respectfully traversed. As stated above, Moon discloses that the two number sections together fold out about their respective hinges to expose the pad underneath. However, neither Moon nor Zatloukal disclose a game pad underneath the number dial pad which is completely covered when the dial pad is in a closed position, wherein the entire second portion folds out sideways with respect to the housing about one hinge axis to an open position to reveal said game pad, as recited in Claim 29. Considering that the two references

combined together do not reach each and every element/limitation of Claim 29, Claim 29 is not obvious over Moon and Zatloukal. For at least these reasons, Claim 29 is allowable over the cited references. Claims 30, 31 and 36-39 are all dependent on Claim 29 and are therefore allowable.

Claims 4, 15, 17, 28, 44 and 55 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Moon in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0,072,395 (hereinafter “Miramontes”). Claims 5-6, 18-19 and 45-46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Moon in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,825,832 (hereinafter “Chung”). Claims 7-9, 20-22, 33-35 and 47-49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Moon in view of Chung, and further in view of Zatloukal. Claims 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Moon in view of Zatloukal, and further in view of Chung. Claims 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Moon in view of Zatloukal, and further in view of Chung. Claims 40 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Moon in view of Zatloukal, and further in view of Miramontes. These rejections are respectfully traversed. The above dependent claims are all dependent on allowable base claims described above. Accordingly, these dependent claims are also allowable.

Conclusion

It is believed that this reply places the above-identified patent application into condition for allowance. Early favorable consideration of this reply is earnestly solicited.


If, in the opinion of the Examiner, an interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the number indicated below.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Please charge any additional required fee or credit any overpayment not otherwise paid or credited to our deposit account No. 50-1698.

Dated: 8/1/07

Respectfully submitted,


Suvashis Bhattacharya
Reg. No. 46,554

Thelen Reid Brown Raysman & Steiner LLP
P.O. Box 640640
San Jose, CA 95164-0640
Tel. (408) 292-5800
Fax. (408) 287-8040